

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6-21, 26 and 27 are rejected. Claims 1-4, 6-21 and 26 and 27 stand rejected. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Certain claims have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The drawings have been accepted. The Examiner's objections and rejections are addressed in substantially the same order as in the pending Office Action.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4, 11 12, 21, 26 and 27 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant has corrected each of the noted informalities.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 12, 21, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,213,226 to ("Eppink") et al. Applicant has studied the Eppink reference and make the following observations:

(i) Eppink states in numerous passages that the described fixed blade stabilizer does not contact a wellbore wall. This condition is shown in Fig. 21 and described as follows: "However, for reasons previously discussed, typically, the use of a fixed blade stabilizer as the upper stabilizer in the bottom hole assembly is less preferred since the fixed blades do not engage the wall of the new borehole 220 such as is illustrated in FIG. 21." Fig. 18 shows fixed blades touching a casing 210, not a wellbore wall.

(ii) Eppink uses adjustable stabilizers that expand to a full gage outer diameter as shown in Figs. 19, 22, 24 and 26. Eppink does not show adjustable stabilizers that expand to an undergage outer diameter.

With respect to amended claims 1, 13, and 21, Eppink does not teach or suggest a first adjustable stabilizer, a second stabilizer including a plurality of

ribs having an undergauge outer diameter, and engaging a wellbore wall using at least one of the plurality of ribs of the second stabilizer. In contrast, Eppink teaches either (i) two adjustable stabilizers or (ii) one adjustable stabilizer and one fixed undergauge blade stabilizer that does not engage a wellbore wall (e.g., Fig. 21). Thus, claims 1, 13, and 21, are allowable over Eppink.

With respect to amended claims 2, 15 and 26, Eppink does not teach or suggest at least one independently adjustable rib for an undergauge second stabilizer. As noted previously, Eppink teaches a second stabilizer that expands to a full gage outer diameter and that has adjustable ribs. Thus, claims 2, 15 and 26 are allowable over Eppink.

With respect to amended claims 3 and 14, Eppink does not teach or suggest a second stabilizer that is a fixed blade stabilizer and that engages a wellbore wall. Thus, claims 3 and 14 are allowable over Eppink.

With respect to amended claim 6 and 16, Eppink does not teach or suggest comprising causing no wall contact on an upper portion of the second stabilizer and causing wall contact at a lower portion of the second stabilizer. As noted previously, Eppink teaches a fixed blade stabilizer that does not engage a wellbore wall (e.g., Fig. 21). Thus, claims 6 and 16 are allowable over Eppink.

Claims 4, 7-12, 14, 17-20 and 27 depend from a base claim that is believed to be allowable. Thus, these dependent claims are believed to be allowable on at least such grounds.

CONCLUSION

Consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee and credit any overpayment associated with this response to Deposit Account No. **02-0429(564-12835-USCQ)**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 13, 2007

/Chandran D. Kumar/
Chandran D. Kumar, Reg. No.: 48,679
Madan, Mossman & Sriram, P.C.
2603 Augusta Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77057-5638
Tel: (713) 266-1130
Fax: (713) 266-8510
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS